Members Present: Bica, Ducksworth-Lawton, Dunham, Gannon, Hoepner, Lapp, Mowry, Pratt, Wical

Guests: Michael Carney, Margaret Cassidy

Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

1.0 Meeting Minutes
   Members approved the minutes for 5.5.15 as distributed with the addition of Mowry’s name as secretary for the meeting.

2.0 Recommendation Based on the Materials Science Program Review
   Members discussed minor revisions to the Materials Science narrative. Pratt will strike the category of “Grow” that was added to the Program Review Form for this program in order to maintain consistency across reviews. Support for growth of this program is clearly reflected in narrative. Pratt will distribute revised review documents to all involved units.

3.0 Proposed Revisions to the Program Review Process and Procedures
   Members discussed review process and procedures. See appendix for information.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted
Lori Bica, secretary for the meeting
Appendix

Text Changes to the Process and Procedures for Academic Department/Program Review
(as appearing in the email dated 5.12.15 from Pratt to M. Carney)

• Page 1: formal review at least once every seven years. Justification: five years is too short a time and increases faculty workload; ten years is too long. APC views as their responsibilities to a) advocate for programs as well as b) highlight issues that need to be addressed.

• Page 2: Retain current wording in the “Academic Policies Committee Recommendations” and “Provost” sections related to the APC submitting the narrative and form to the AVC, who then forwards it on to the Provost. Justification: the APC did not agree on general-enough verbiage to indicate the additional step the AVC takes without constraining a person who assumes the AVC position in the future and might change what he or she does.”

• Page 2: Add new section “DEAN RESPONSE” with the following text between the “Program Response” and the “Academic Policies Committee Recommendations”: “The AVC will forward the review materials to the college dean. The college dean will complete the appropriate section of the review form and submit it and any associated narrative to the AVC.” Justification: aligning the procedures with the current process.

• Page 2, Academic Policies Committee Recommendations section, sentence one: Add “, with a copy to the program” at the end of the sentence. The full sentence should read as follows: “The AVC will distribute the review form and all attachments to the Academic Policies Committee (and/or Graduate Council), with a copy to the program.” Justification: the APC finds value in having the chair aware of the Dean’s response before our discussion.

• Page 3: Change “December” to “February” for the “Provost ‘report back’ to Academic Policies Committee….” Since this change logistically places the Provost’s report in the second academic year after the review, please move the Provost’s report to the section title “In the Second Academic Year after the Review” and delete the section title “In the Academic Year after the Review.” Justification: the February 2015 review instead of the December 2014 review worked well. December is a busy time both for motions moving through APC and for the APC members who are trying to finish up their semesters.

Other Process Items Discussed

• One of the Chancellor’s Task Forces (workload???) suggested that the entire process and procedure for program review be reconsidered and perhaps redefined. The above text edits impact the existing process and procedures and might not be applicable in the future version of the Program Review.

• Inequitable internal review assignments is an issue that needs to be addressed in future discussion about the Program Review process. Some departments are functioning very effectively, resulting in little more than supportive comments from the internal reviewers. In contrast, other departments have serious issues, resulting in extra work by the internal reviewers to understand and synthesize the issues in order to make relevant, thoughtful recommendations to the Program.
• The APC values the different perspectives provided by both internal and external reviewers.
• Three internal reviewers is sufficient, provides an ability to have a majority vote on differing opinions among the internal reviewers, and enables delegation of duties to ensure equitable workload.